

## **Marijuana Policy Panel Meeting Minutes for February 25, 2004**

The meeting was held in City Hall, Room L280 and was convened at approximately 6:15 p.m.

Members in attendance: Carr, Stark, Holden, Cunningham, Licata, Holcomb, Rasmussen, Satterberg, Mochizuki, Nyrop, Kigvamusud<sup>2</sup> Vashti

Members absent: none

Staff: Nuerenberg

Suggestions were made to include public comment in the agenda of each meeting. Panel concurred. Concerns over use of staff time were expressed, which led the panel to request staff hours be logged. In addition, staff will send tentative agenda to panelists for approval prior to upcoming meetings.

### **Background**

Mochizuki presented information about current reporting in the Narcotics Division, as well as a brief history of the department's treatment of drug arrests. Copies of presentation will be available to panel members.

Licata briefed panel members on the legislative role in post-I-75 actions.

When duties of panel were discussed, members identified errors in legislation, namely incorrect dates. Panel debated role in decision-making and altering legislation and ultimately agreed upon the following changes: where March 31, 2003 is given as the deadline for submitting reporting criteria, a new date of March 31, 2004 will be inserted; instead of presenting findings of the panel at the first meeting of the Full City Council in 2006, presentations will be presented at said event in both 2006 and 2007.

### **Election of a Chair/Vice Chair**

Carr nominated Licata for Chair, which received no opposition. A vote was taken, with panel members unanimously electing Licata. Licata nominated Rasmussen for Vice Chair. Again no opposition and a unanimous vote.

### **Presentation/Discussion of Draft Reporting Criteria**

Carr passed out reporting information (behind tab 3 of binders). Debate ensued over value of separating single count drug-related charges from those including a second or third charge. Also, questions arose over breakdowns in race/ethnicity among arrests and prosecutions. Database limitations may prevent the Law Department from fulfilling this request, but Carr will find out for certain. Mochizuki, Satterberg also described difficulty breaking down information in a variety of ways for previous charges and convictions. However, if panel wishes, research can be done to determine new methods for future reports. Panelists were interested in seeing Law, SPD, and the County Prosecutor more effectively coordinate information regarding arrests and prosecutions.

Three categories of marijuana-related charges were identified by panel as areas for their focus. They are: misdemeanor possession (< 40g), felony possession (>40g) without intent to sell, and felony cultivation (any amount). Questions followed. How do we draw distinctions between commercial sales vs. friend to friend sales? What criteria is currently being used to report information? What, by law, should be tracked? No immediate answers were given.

### **Next Steps**

Among the three suggested meeting days and times, March 10, 2004 from 5:30 – 7:30 p.m. was selected due to highest number of expected attendees. No other future meetings were set.

Licata asked panel members to bring, to the March 10, 2004 meeting, how they feel criteria should be set, using the three categories agreed upon.